

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/532,528

Examiner

Christopher R. Harmon

Applicant(s)

REUTELER ET AL

Art Unit

3721

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher R. Harmon

(3) _____

(2) Andrew Dorisio

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 May 2008

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed 1+

Identification of prior art discussed: SEELE ET AL.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: None

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

CLAIMS WERE DISCUSSED INCLUDING DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN PRIOR ART AND APPLICANT'S INVENTION.
CONCERNS WERE RAISED WITH CLAIM SCOPE.
SUGGESTIONS MADE FOR AMENDING CLAIMS TO
INCLUDE DEFINING OVERLYING STRUCTURE OF
THE CONVEYORS RATHER THAN IN TERMS OF THE
PATH OF THE BLANK.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action

Examiner's signature, if required